

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
General Feedback	Kilmorack Community Council(00031)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00031/2/001	General Feedback	Kilmorack Community Council are concerned by the methodology of the MIR and that "inappropriate proposals" were included, they consider that community councils and local councillors are the appropriate forum to identify suitable areas for development. They felt that the evening workshop was not successful.	
General Feedback	Scottish Natural Heritage(00204)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00204/1/001	General Feedback	Stongly advises that HRA is carried and applied (via appropriate developer requirement mitigation) prior to decisions on / publication of Proposed Plan. Also green networks both existing and potential new, are integral to the choices and boundaries of sites chosen for the Proposed Plan. The Plan should take a strategic approach to site selection so that green networks are sufficient to protect wildlife and prevent welfare issues. Asserts that many preferred sites have a natural woodland interest that should preclude development unless there is an overriding public benefit and a justification that no other suitable alternatives exist (Notes SPP para 146 and HwLDP policies 51, 52, and 57 in support of its position). Impacts of preferred sites should be assessed and mitigated if necessary via sustainable deer management. Urges adequate safeguards for water quality that ultimately flows into Moray Firth SAC and expects suitable developer requirement text for relevant sites / settlements. Requests policy and related supplementary guidance to require higher standard of effluent treatment within Loch Flemington SPA catchment.	Appropriate developer requirement mitigation for HRA affected sites and policies. Update badger survey to safeguard badger groups. Better mapping and safeguarding of green networks. Non retention of sites where impact on natural heritage woodland or adequate mitigation (management, equivalent compensatory planting etc). Sustainable deer management developer requirements where appropriate. Water quality developer requirements for sites / settlements discharging to Inner Moray Firth SAC. Policy and related supplementary guidance to require higher standard of effluent treatment within Loch Flemington SPA catchment than presently required.
General Feedback	Ardross Community Council(00267)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00267/1/001	General Feedback	Commend the Planning Department for they way they have conducted this consultation, which has been true consultation with a range of public meetings and where Planners seemed to have actually responded positively to responses. Continually frustrated as to how these documents are interpreted by Planners. The Highland Council core planning documents are usually well thought out and a good response to comments received. When individual applications come in they are almost entirely ignored as well as the community views even when these views are supported by the Highland Council core planning documents.	
General Feedback	Knockbain Community Council(00303)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00303/1/006	General Feedback	Plan difficult to access and read - difficult to find out about the area outwith key settlements.	
General Feedback	Nairn River Community Council(00310)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00310/1/002	General Feedback	Concerned that views of local residents are not considered as much as those of local land owners and developers.	Reappraisal of population and housing projections with significantly less sites being supported for development in Nairn.
General Feedback	Nigg & Shandwick Community Council(00313)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00313/1/001	General Feedback	Reducing 9 local plan areas to 4 LDP areas is questionable. Areas are too large. Time taken to finalise the plan is too lengthy considering it has to be updated every 5 years. There should be a rolling program of updates driven by necessity and local demand.	
General Feedback	Raigmore Community Council(00314)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00314/1/008	General Feedback	Raigmore Community Council thanks THC for the opportunity to comment on the proposals and commends the Council's encouragement to comment on wider issues within the Plan.	
General Feedback	Tain Community Council(00322)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00322/1/011	General Feedback	Sufficient latitude should be built in to plan to ensure developer-led development (unforeseen during plan review) will not be precluded during lifetime of the plan. Plan purpose should be to lead and guide stakeholders and not taken as a strict set of rules. Development management needs to retain flexibility of determination.	
General Feedback	Mr William Boyd(00332)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00332/2/001	General Feedback	Consultation considered successful, reassured development planners will consider wider factors than the built environment in the planning process. Response to plans for development and opportunity to comment was positive.	
General Feedback	Tulloch Homes Ltd(00393)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00393/1/001	General Feedback	Purpose of the MIR is unclear. Section 6 would be more useful in Developer Contributions SG. MIR is constrained.	Section 6 would be more usefully placed in the Developer Contributions: Supplementary Guidance.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
General Feedback	G H Johnston Building Consultants Ltd(00424)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00424/1/001	General Feedback	Council should enable a masterplanning approach to new development rather than piecemeal to coordinate evidence base for infrastructure and agree mitigation measures. Where judgements depend on detailed evidence, the evidence would be expected as part of future development proposals. Plan should be flexible enough to respect that principle and ensure consistency with the HwLDP. HwLDP policies require impacts/mitigation to be assessed and demonstrated through supporting evidence. This can be co-ordinated as masterplans for large sites. The Main Issues Report does tend to convey premature judgements for some sites. This is pertinent to allocations that promote economic development where a comprehensive assessment of available land and maximising the potential for development could be vital to the viability of development. Purpose of a LDP is to promote sustainable development and developments must demonstrate assessments of impacts and mitigation. The HwLDP encourages this and informs implementation of proposals on land allocated in the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan (IMFLDP). It is assumed by the respondent that the IMFLDP will add detail to HwLDP allocations and identify other/new sites. NOTE: This is being raised as a general concern relating to numerous GHJ sites where they feel the allocation of a whole site is essential to comprehensive masterplan approach.	
General Feedback	Highlands & Islands Green Party(00491)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00491/1/010	General Feedback	Adjacent allocations of B, MU and H and R should, unless there are particular reasons otherwise, be merged to allow a holistic view of development rather than the current rigid zoning.	
General Feedback	Highlands & Islands Green Party(00491)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00491/1/033	General Feedback	The Main Issues Report does not sufficiently address the very important issue of Climate Change. The Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 Section 72 requires Local Development Plans to contain policies to ensure that new buildings produce reduced levels of CO2 emissions. New policy suggested for climate change.	Propose the following policy should be included;- All new buildings must reduce the predicted carbon dioxide emissions standard through their siting, layout and design and the installation of appropriate technologies. After 2012, the reduction must be 60%, after 2016 the reduction must be 100% (no emissions).
General Feedback	Mrs E Holland(00509)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00509/1/004	General Feedback	Supportive of consultation and hopes proper weight will be given to residents' concerns and aspirations.	
General Feedback	Mrs C Stafford(00511)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00511/1/002	General Feedback	Overall experience of consultation was not positive;- evening meeting was dominated by distrust of Council officers preventing attendees from engaging fully;- officers were insufficiently prepared for meeting;- statutory advertisement had wrong submission deadline on it;- no hard copy of amendments list provided;- difficulty viewing the Inverness City text and map at the same time;- unfavourable impression of the planning system, loss of trust with the planning system;- distance between community and decision makers, all should work together in an open, transparent system for the good of the Highlands. Response may have suffered due to loss of faith in the Council. MIR appears like an old style draft plan but with lack of detail, and does not guide the discussion it is supposed to.	
General Feedback	Alison Lowe And Michael Hutcheson(00520)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00520/1/001	General Feedback	Council Planners should identify reasonable development sites then undertake public consultation on those, rather than the 'call for sites' which is considered results in inappropriate sites.	
General Feedback	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/004	General Feedback	SEPA assumes where the MIR flags up an issue that this will result in a specific developer requirement within the proposed plan. If this does not occur SEPA are likely to object to many of the allocations highlighted within the detailed spreadsheet. SEPA would expect any proposed sites to be in accordance with the policies of the HwLDP therefore for many allocations SEPA propose a general approach to waste water drainage issues and buffers to water bodies as detailed in their submission, noting page 99 of SEA concurs with this approach.	
General Feedback	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/006	General Feedback	SEPA expects all allocations to connect to the public sewer in line with Policy 65 of the HwLDP. SEPA therefore does not expect every allocation to have "connection to the public sewer" as a developer requirement as they have to comply with Policy 65. 15 sites are highlighted where SEPA would object unless "connection to the public sewer" or wording to that effect is a developer requirement for those sites.	SEPA request the inclusion of wording such as "connection to the public sewer" or similar wording as a developer requirement for a set of specific sites.
General Feedback	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/009	General Feedback	SEPA expects all allocations to comply with Policy 63 of the HwLDP and the 6m minimum buffer to water bodies in Section 10 of the Flood Risk and Drainage Impact Assessment SG. SEPA therefore does not expect every allocation to have a developer requirement ensuring a buffer to water bodies present on each site. SEPA have identified certain sites where they would object unless a developer requirement (such as in enclosed spreadsheet- see rep) is included in the proposed plan.	SEPA request the inclusion of wording such as "connection to the public sewer" or similar wording as a developer requirement for a set of specific sites.

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
General Feedback	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/010	General Feedback	SEPA likely to object to certain sites where wetlands (protected under the Water Framework Directive) may be present on site unless a developer requirement to assess for wetlands and mitigate impacts if necessary is included.	SEPA request the inclusion of reference to protection of wetlands as a developer requirement for a set of specific sites.
General Feedback	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/011	General Feedback	SEPA expects the development of all allocations to comply with Policy 70 of the HwLDP and Managing Waste in New Developments SG. As above, SEPA would not expect to add the requirements set out as developer requirements for every site.	
General Feedback	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/012	General Feedback	SEPA considers the IMF LDP will not identify any specific sites for waste management facilities. Both SPP (paragraph 215) and Zero Waste Plan (Annex B) require that development plans identify and allow for a range and choice of sites where waste management facilities can appropriately be located. HwLDP contains policies which provide this information, SEPA therefore recommend that the IMF LDP should be consistent with the HwLDP, specifically Policy 70: Waste Management Facilities and Policy 71: Safeguarding of Waste Management Sites in identifying existing or allocated industrial land as acceptable for waste management facility proposals. SEPA supports the identification of existing waste management sites within the Proposals Map supported by a statement that considers these appropriate for additional waste management activities, ensuring existing waste management facilities are safeguarded, including ensuring adequate space surrounding these facilities is provided to allow these to grow in the future without being prejudiced or restricted by adjoining land uses.	
General Feedback	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/013	General Feedback	SEPA considers the IMF LDP will not identify any specific sites for waste management facilities. Both SPP (paragraph 215) and Zero Waste Plan (Annex B) require that development plans identify and allow for a range and choice of sites where waste management facilities can appropriately be located. HwLDP contains policies which provide this information, SEPA therefore recommend that the IMF LDP should be consistent with the HwLDP, specifically Policy 70: Waste Management Facilities and Policy 71: Safeguarding of Waste Management Sites in identifying existing or allocated industrial land as acceptable for waste management facility proposals. SEPA supports the identification of existing waste management sites within the Proposals Map supported by a statement that considers these appropriate for additional waste management activities, ensuring existing waste management facilities are safeguarded, including ensuring adequate space surrounding these facilities is provided to allow these to grow in the future without being prejudiced or restricted by adjoining land uses.	
General Feedback	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/015	General Feedback	SEPA have highlighted a number of sites where further flood risk assessment is required prior to their inclusion in the Proposed Plan and would object in principle to the inclusion of these sites without this assessment. SEPA have provided many sites where we would not object to their allocations in the Proposed Plan provided developer requirements are included within the Proposed Plan. SEPA have only flagged up flood risk from small watercourses where we feel there may be a particular issue with that site which may require a Flood Risk Assessment. Within Inverness there are a number of allocations close to the Caledonian Canal. SEPA recommends THC consult British Waterways regarding any impacts upon canal embankments.	
General Feedback	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/020	General Feedback	Development Plans in future will require consideration of Flood Risk Management Plans. SEPA would advise that the location of the IMF LDP is within a number of PVAs (12 Potentially Vulnerable Areas). Any locations within a LDP outwith a PVA should not be assumed to be free from flood risk. SEPA has produced the NFRA (National Flood Risk Assessment) as the first stage of the Flood Risk Management Planning process. Further detailed information on each PVA is attached (see rep).	
General Feedback	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/028	General Feedback	Continuing pollution is affecting Loch Flemington's conservation status, and it is currently classified as being in unfavourable condition in relation to most of its conservation objectives. Loch Flemington requires special measures to protect it so there is a need to adopt a pro-active approach to ensure future development can be accommodated locally whilst minimising additional pollution entering the catchment area and affecting this important Loch. SEPA notes Loch Leven in Fife suffers a similar problem and Perth and Kinross Council have adopted SG through their LDP which requires a high level of treatment for new waste water discharges and improvement to existing waste water discharges for the Loch Leven catchment area.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
General Feedback	Scottish Environment Protection Agency(00523)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00523/1/029	General Feedback	SEPA's work has determined the exact area which is in hydrogeological conductivity with Loch Flemington and would like this more focussed area used as a basis for future policy where developments could be assessed against specific SG adopted as part of the plan. Planning authorities are "responsible authorities" under The Water Environment and Water Services (Scotland) Act 2003 and as such are required to ensure compliance with the Water Framework Directive and river basin planning process in carrying out their statutory functions. To achieve this, water bodies must be protected from deterioration and action taken to enhance and restore any that need improvement. Policy 63 of the HwLDP states that the Council supports proposals for development. SEPA would therefore likely object unless specific policy or commitment was included in the Proposed Plan requiring developments within a newly agreed, smaller Loch Flemington catchment to comply with SG. SEPA would work with the Council to identify the small local catchment which could be shown in the Proposed Plan and associated inset maps for a full and proper community consultation.	Likely to object unless a specific policy or commitment was included within the Proposed Plan which required developments within a newly agreed and smaller Loch Flemington Catchment to comply with Supplementary Guidance.
General Feedback	Councillor David Chisholm(00537)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00537/1/008	General Feedback	The term 'Mixed Use' is too vague. There needs to be further clarity as to what is being proposed, for example, a percentage allocation for each of the uses proposed with a discretionary element of approx. 10%. Objects to all MUs unless further clarity is provided.	The term Mixed Use is too vague, further advice regarding the the percentage mix for each individual use should be given with a discretionary element of approximately 10% included. Object to the inclusion of the policy approach without the inclusion of greater detail.
General Feedback	Cromarty Allotments And Gardens Society(00667)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00667/1/003	General Feedback	CAGS thanks the council for the opportunity to offer feedback, and for providing the 'round-table' event in Cromarty. CAGS appreciate the difficult balancing act to perform when deciding on policy and appreciate the work put into the process.	
General Feedback	Mr Kenneth Mackenzie(00694)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00694/1/001	General Feedback	Attended Seaboard Villages exhibition and evening meeting, noting an informative and constructive discussion took place in respect of the proposed development sites in and around the villages.	
General Feedback	Mrs Karin Kremer(00729)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00729/1/003	General Feedback	Requests that housing is not situated in areas which flood as they have had problems with flooding.	
General Feedback	Mr William Sutherland(00782)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00782/1/005	General Feedback	Most people in Muir of Ord do not attend LDP meetings, or wait until development plans are progressed, and then complain when development is proposed.	
General Feedback	Dr Ros Rowell(00885)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00885/1/003	General Feedback	Section 6.6 is not easy to understand and it is also difficult to understand what difference any proposed hinterland boundary change makes to how development would be restricted within and outwith this boundary.	
General Feedback	Miss Susanna Leslie(00888)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00888/2/002	General Feedback	North Kessock public exhibition was poorly publicised, only hearing about it through word of mouth from community councillor.	
General Feedback	Strathdearn Community Council(00908)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00908/1/011	General Feedback	Although not opposed in principle to further expansion of Inverness, Strathdearn CC urges the Council to ensure developers adopt best practice in sustainable urban design and implement appropriate levels of community services.Regarding safety of A9(T) Strathdearn CC are concerned about junction arrangements approaching Inverness which despite being adequate in design terms (Moy 2+1) project) they are not considered ideal. Strathdearn CC would like to see, concomitant improvements to broadband in surrounding rural areas alongside Inverness improvements, the road/rail/cycle/historic military road route through Strathdearn recognised as National Tourism Trail, safer cycle links to Inverness, and protection of the important landscape setting to Inverness that Strathdearn provides in relation to onshore wind proposals.	Developments in Inverness south to show best practice in sustainable urban design, implement appropriate levels of community services. Improvements are sought to the Inshes roundabout, and to service provision of the south side of the city to minimise their travel distance.Would like to see, concomitant improvements to broadband in surrounding rural areas alongside Inverness improvements, the road/rail/cycle/historic military road route through Strathdearn recognised as National Tourism Trail, safer cycle links to Inverness, and protection of the important landscape setting to Inverness that Strathdearn provides in relation to onshore wind proposals.
General Feedback	Mr John Duncan(00915)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00915/1/006	General Feedback	Most people were not aware that they could comment on sites proposed during the call for sites, in particular to provide comments on why a site should be safeguarded from development. (NOTE: Site was not in MIR as a preferred site. It was classed as housing in the countryside and referred to the area office).	
General Feedback	Mr John Duncan(00915)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00915/1/007	General Feedback	Lack of advance local publicity for consultation events in Dores and Fort Augustus.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
General Feedback	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/001	General Feedback	Proposed Plan should contribute to the Scottish Government's central purpose to create a more successful country through increasing sustainable economic growth. Proposed Plan should also demonstrate how the Council intends to contribute to the national actions set out in NPF2. Scottish Government is pleased that the Council has identified a wide range and number of potential development sites across the IMF area, and that key development issues have been set out. Scottish Government expect the PP to be clear on how requirements for development sites in the IMF Plan will sit alongside those identified in the HwLDP.SG would like to see the PP take a place-based approach, in line with the principles of Designing Places and Designing Streets, achievable by putting more emphasis on illustrations and maps and giving more sense-of-place sites by demonstrating their interconnectedness and showing how THC expects to see them grow during the lifetime of the plan.	The PP needs to be clear on how the requirements for development sites in the Inner Moray Firth Plan will sit alongside those identified in the HwLDP and needs to identify enough housing land that is either effective or capable of becoming effective up to year 10 from its predicted adoption. Take a place based approach to the PP in line with the principles of Designing Places and Designing streets and consider the graphic communication of the development plan.
General Feedback	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/005	General Feedback	Transport Assessments (TAs) will be required to allow the specific mitigation measures to be agreed. Any transport interventions that emerge from the LDP process and that have been fully assessed using DPMTAG (Development Planning and Management Transport Appraisal), and which also receive support in principle from Transport Scotland, will not need to be subject to further appraisal at a later stage. There are a number of sites in the MIR which have a direct impact on the trunk road network. Cognisance will have to be taken of these proposed developments and also those close enough to have an impact on the trunk road. TS expect that existing trunk road junctions will be used in preference to new junctions to reduce the impact on the trunk road network. Where developments propose a new junction to the trunk road, the development will be looked at in relation to surrounding proposals and an access strategy for the corridor will be examined so that developments are viewed in the wider context rather than on a piecemeal basis.	
General Feedback	The Scottish Government(00957)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/00957/1/006	General Feedback	Without the size of developments it is not possible to establish the effect of each of them so Transport Scotland require that in advance of the PP this information is quantified and the effects are established. The comments are provided for sites which TS has not previously commented upon in the HwLDP and where TS considers there could be a potential impact to the trunk road network. In accordance with SPP, TS recommends that direct access onto any strategic road should be avoided as far as practicable. Access should be from a secondary road unless there is no alternative.	Direct access onto any strategic road should be avoided as far as practicable. Access should be from a secondary road unless there is no alternative.
General Feedback	Inverness Civic Trust(01064)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01064/2/004	General Feedback	Limited time available for representations on a plan of such wide scope and complexity has restricted the detailed study required resulting in comments being necessarily curtailed.	
General Feedback	Ms Elizabeth Davis(01086)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01086/1/001	General Feedback	IMF MIR presents the prospect of a well-planned and comprehensive plan however cost of proposals is an issue.	
General Feedback	Ms Elizabeth Davis(01086)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01086/1/003	General Feedback	Re-acquire council houses when they are put up for sale. Cease the sale of council houses without a pre-emption clause in the missives.	
General Feedback	Ms Elizabeth Davis(01086)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01086/1/006	General Feedback	Stop change of use permissions to convert residential dwellings to commercial use. Procure properties to be converted to residential dwellings. Change business rates to make town centre locations more attractive to companies.	
General Feedback	Ms Elizabeth Davis(01086)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01086/1/012	General Feedback	English language should be used more prominently if dual language signage is to be used.	
General Feedback	Ms Elizabeth Davis(01086)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01086/1/013	General Feedback	There is no mention of planning for the homeless, jobless, addicts etc. Accepted this is a job for the housing department but it is the responsibility of the planners to allocate appropriate accommodation.	
General Feedback	Mrs Maureen Butchard(01149)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01149/1/002	General Feedback	Would like to be better informed of plans	
General Feedback	Mr John D Murrie(01182)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01182/1/001	General Feedback	Local residents/neighbours should be consulted to gain important local knowledge on sites before making preferred/non-preferred decisions - sites should not be given automatic preference by the Council simply by meeting certain criteria. When there remains sufficient site capacity the settlement boundary should not be extended, e.G. Muir of Ord. The Call for Sites form is favoured towards developers and those who can have it professionally completed as the questions can be manipulated. To protect neighbouring properties, the Call for Sites form should ask for details of potential drainage/flooding issues downstream (to take account of SPP3, SPP7, PAN69). Only housing should be included within the plan as sites do not tend to be developed by the landowner and the final development is often significantly different from the original proposal.	

ISSUE	NAME	OUR REF.	POLICY/SITE NAME	COMMENT	MODIFICATION SOUGHT
General Feedback	Mr George MacWilliam(01215)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01215/1/001	General Feedback	Considers insufficient publicity has been given to the plan and the Council must bear some responsibility for the lack of any real interest which is likely to become the blue print for major changes to the city. THC must address how it achieves greater public response to these proposals and similar ones in the future.	
General Feedback	Mr And Mrs Gordon Penwright(01216)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01216/1/002	General Feedback	Considers format of MIR consultation was 'ridiculous' for the following reasons:- overuse of technical language and jargon;- advertising posters were bland and text was too small;- plan name does not alert residents in the Black Isle that it will affect them;- a workshop suggests compulsory involvement which may put people off;- a planning degree is needed to make sense of the comments form;- Cromarty workshop dominated by those who had something to gain from the allocation of sites and so was not a representative group. Posters would have been more effective by stating "Public Meeting to Discuss Potential Sites for Planning in Cromarty." Provide simple, plain English introduction to meeting and how it could affect the town. Comments forms should also be in plain English for people to feedback on the sites affecting their area with space for additional comments on wider issues affecting the plan. Format excluded the majority of people who may not understand the document and/or been put off public meeting.	
General Feedback	Deveron Homes Ltd(01247)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01247/1/001	General Feedback	The MIR is considered to be confusing in terms of the relationship between the IMFLDP and the HwLDP general policies.	
General Feedback	Richard Crawford - Collective Response(01352)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01352/1/005	General Feedback	Council should take greater action to enforce planning conditions. Suggests solution that permission for later phases of a large development should be withheld until issues with previous phases have been resolved.	
General Feedback	Mr John West(01713)	IMFLDP_MAIN/CONS/01713/2/001	General Feedback	Considers time between MIR City Centre exhibition and evening workshop (25th June) and deadline for comments (6th July) was too tight to prepare a considered response, particularly given it was during the summer period. Requested extended deadline, presumably this was given as a second response was received on the 27th July.	